	1
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
2	X
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, : 19-CR-0074(ERK)
4	:
5	: -against- : United States Courthouse
6	: Brooklyn, New York
7	: : : Manday June 1 2020
8	: Monday, June 1, 2020 STEPHEN COTOGNO, : 10:00 a.m.
9	Defendant.
10	: X
11	X
12	TRANSCRIPT OF CRIMINAL CAUSE FOR SENTENCING
13	BEFORE THE HONORABLE ERIC R. KOMITEE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
14	APPEARANCES:
15	For the Government: RICHARD P. DONOGHUE, ESQ.
16	United States Attorney Eastern District of New York
17	271 Cadman Plaza East Brooklyn, New York 11201
18	BY: JAMES P. McDONALD, ESQ. GENNY NGAI, ESQ.
19	Assistant United States Attorneys
20	For the Defendant: LaRUSSO CONWAY & BARTLING, LLP
21	300 Old Country Road Suite 341
22	Mineola, New York 11501 BY:ROBERT P. LaRUSSO, ESQ.
23	
24	Court Reporter: Stacy A. Mace, RMR, CRR, RPR, CCR Official Court Reporter
25	E-mail: SMaceRPR@gmail.com Proceedings recorded by computerized stenography. Transcript produced by Computer-aided Transcription.

```
2
                   Proceedings - Via Videoconference
                            (In open court.)
1
 2
            (All participants via video and teleconference.)
 3
                  (Judge ERIC R. KOMITEE presiding.)
 4
              THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Criminal cause for
    sentencing, Docket Number 19-CR-274, United States of America
5
6
    versus Stephen Cotogno.
7
              Would you all please state your appearances for the
8
    record, starting with the Government?
9
              MR. McDONALD: Good morning, Your Honor.
10
              Good morning, everyone. It's James McDonald on
    behalf of the United States.
11
12
              THE COURT: Good morning.
13
              MS. NGAI: Good morning, Your Honor. I'm also
    joining for the Government, and this is Genny Ngai.
14
15
              THE COURT: Good morning.
16
              MR. LaRUSSO: And Robert La Russo representing
17
    Mr. Cotogno.
18
              Good morning, Your Honor. Good morning, everybody.
19
              THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. LaRusso.
20
              USPO DENIZ: And good morning, Your Honor, Angelica
21
    Deniz with United States Probation.
22
                          Good morning. Good to have you on.
              THE COURT:
23
              THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: That's it, Judge.
24
              THE COURT: All right, thank you.
25
              So, we're here today for a sentencing as everyone
```

Proceedings - Via Videoconference 3 1 knows. 2 First off, can I just make sure I understand how to 3 pronounce the defendant's name? And it sounds like people are 4 mostly saying Mr. *KUH-TOG-NOE*. 5 THE DEFENDANT: That's correct, Judge. THE COURT: 6 Okay. I am very sympathetic, as somebody whose last name 7 8 is mispronounced much more frequently than it's pronounced 9 correctly. 10 THE DEFENDANT: Actually, you did it perfect. THE COURT: Okay, good. 11 12 So, these are, obviously, not ideal circumstances in 13 which to be going forward for sentencing, but we are living in 14 less than perfect times right now and this may be the best option that we have under the circumstances. 15 16 I want to start out by saying, so I have a series of 17 screens in front of me and I also have a printed out outline 18 for sentencing, just to make sure I cover every matter that we 19 need to cover on the record. 20 For everybody on the call, but, Mr. Cotogno, for you 21 in particular, if you see me looking off what seems to my 22 left, I am not checking on news or the Internet or anything, 23 I'm looking at various records --24 THE DEFENDANT: Okay. 25 THE COURT: -- that I have in front of me.

The first thing we need to do is just acknowledge that we are moving forward by videoconference at Mr. Cotogno's request and with his consent. That is not something that has always been allowed under the Rules of Criminal Procedure, namely to have sentencing proceedings by video, and there are certain findings that I need to make before we go forward this way.

In plain English, Mr. Cotogno, I just want to start out by saying that if you wanted to delay this sentencing proceeding until it was deemed safe for you to travel and for us to gather in court, we would accommodate that request, but I understand that you wish to go forward today by video instead of waiting to move forward in person.

Is that correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, that's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. So as I mentioned, I need to make certain findings on the record to move forward that way.

First, do you understand you have the right to be physically present in open court for sentencing?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I understand.

THE COURT: And you understand that you have the right to consult with your lawyer during the sentencing, so if we were in court together we would go off the record for a period, you and your attorney would find a place in the hallway or in a conference room where you could confer with

Proceedings - Via Videoconference 5 each other, but out of earshot of the Court or the Government 1 2 or the Probation Department or anybody else. We can make that 3 happen in this virtual environment as well. If there is any 4 point at which you need to confer with your lawyer because you 5 don't understand what's going on or because you have questions or anything you want to consult with your lawyer about, we can 6 7 arrange that by what I guess people are calling a virtual 8 breakout room, where you and Mr. LaRusso could speak to one 9 another, but nobody else would be party to that, that particular conversation. 10 11 Do you understand that? 12 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I understand. 13 THE COURT: Okay. 14 Have you consulted with your attorney regarding the waiver of your right to appear here in person? 15 16 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have. 17 THE COURT: Okay. And you understand that your 18 family members and other supporters also have the right to 19 attend this proceeding? 20 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 21 THE COURT: Okay. 22 Do you agree to waive your right to appear in person 23 for sentencing and instead appear by video? 24 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do. THE COURT: Okay. 25

Proceedings - Via Videoconference

Your lawyer and also the lawyer for the Government have indicated that the reason, or at least part of the reason, you want to proceed expeditiously here by video is because of your age and certain medical conditions. And specifically, your lawyer has indicated that you would have extreme difficulty in traveling to the Eastern District of New York for in-person sentencing, both because of your medical conditions and because of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Is that a fair statement of why you want to move forward by video here today?

THE DEFENDANT: It's actual statement, yes, it's -- it's true.

THE COURT: Okay, thank you.

All right. So, based on that conversation I now make the following findings:

I find that the Judicial Conference has determined that the COVID-19 emergency is materially affecting the functioning of the federal courts. These are findings that are required by the new statute that allowed us to proceed by video. I find that Chief Judge Mauskopf, the chief judge of the Eastern District of New York, has issued an order dated March 30th of 2020 finding that felony sentencing under Rule 32 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure cannot be conducted in person without seriously jeopardizing public health and safety.

Proceedings - Via Videoconference

Because Mr. Cotogno is seeking a sentence of probation and because of his advanced age, or at least a non-custodial sentence I should say, and because of his advanced age and ongoing medical conditions, I now find that further delay of this proceeding would create the risk of serious harm to the interests of justice, and I cite Administrative Order Number 2021-13 at paragraph 2. That is the order from the Chief Judge that I mentioned a few moments ago.

I further find that Mr. Cotogno has knowingly and voluntarily waived his right to appear physically in court and has agreed knowingly and voluntarily to proceed by videoconference.

I find that the measures taken to provide public access to this proceeding are reasonable under the circumstances, and that to the extent the defendant's right to public access is in any way impaired, Mr. Cotogno has knowingly and voluntarily waived that right.

Let me start off by describing for the record the arrangements that we have set up for this proceeding.

On your screen you should be able to see me, my courtroom deputy, Ms. Guy, the lawyers, both your lawyer and the lawyers for the Government. You will not see the probation officer, but you should be able to hear her.

Is it accurate to say that you can see and hear, as

```
Proceedings - Via Videoconference
                                                                  8
    relevant, those people?
1
 2
              THE DEFENDANT: I cannot.
              THE COURT: Cannot?
 3
 4
              THE DEFENDANT: I cannot.
              THE COURT: You can't see anybody?
 5
              THE DEFENDANT: I see four -- six people.
6
7
              THE COURT: Okay, so you see your lawyer?
8
              THE DEFENDANT: I see my lawyer.
9
              THE COURT:
                          Do you see me?
10
              THE DEFENDANT: If I knew what you looked like. I
11
    see --
12
              THE COURT: I am wearing a blue blazer and a white
13
    V-shirt with no tie.
14
              Do you see me or no?
15
              THE DEFENDANT: No, I don't. I see a white
16
    shirt and a medical blazer, and then I see, I think it's James
17
    McDonald, I'm not sure.
18
              THE COURT: Mr. McDonald is wearing a blue suit and
19
    a white shirt with a blue tie.
20
              THE DEFENDANT: I see him.
21
              THE COURT: I am now waving my hands.
22
              THE DEFENDANT: I don't see you.
23
              THE COURT: Okay. All right, so we are, obviously,
24
    proceeding under less than perfect circumstances here, and I
25
    think the question for both Mr. LaRusso and for Mr. Cotogno is
```

9 Proceedings - Via Videoconference given the technical difficulties that we have had so far, 1 2 given the defendants, obviously, have a right to see the judge 3 at sentencing. I can see Mr. Cotogno, which is important to 4 me, but I understand the situation is not working in reverse. 5 The question, Mr. LaRusso, to you and your client is, do you want to proceed under these circumstances and do 6 7 you believe that for all the reasons I said before that it is 8 important to do so, even given some of the technical issues we 9 are having, rather than wait to proceed in person? 10 MR. LaRUSSO: Your Honor, my opinion right now and my advice to my client would be that under the circumstances I 11 12 think we should go forward. I think the Court has all the 13 information necessary and as the Court indicated, you are able 14 to see my client. I don't know how important it is to my client to see you. I can say that you have a nice beard, Your 15 16 Honor. 17 THE COURT: Thank you. 18 MR. LaRUSSO: I've wanted to grow one, so I'm 19 jealous, I'll be honest with you. 20 THE COURT: I have been working on it during 21 quarantine, so... 22 MR. LaRUSSO: But I'll leave it up to him, Judge, if 23 there is a personal opinion that he feels it's necessary to be 24 able to see you, I would advise that we go forward. 25 THE DEFENDANT: I have no problem with that, Bob.

Proceedings - Via Videoconference 10 1 For me to make that trip, I don't even know if I could do it, 2 I'll be honest with you. 3 MR. LaRUSSO: Your Honor, just to bring you up to 4 I spoke with Mr. Cotogno last night, and though his 5 face doesn't really reflect it, he has been in constant pain primarily because of his back, and he indicated to me he 6 7 really would like to move forward to be able to take care of 8 his ailments and his age and to be able to spend time with his 9 family. 10 So I think his decision to go forward is based upon solid -- a solid foundation, Your Honor. 11 12 THE COURT: Okay. 13 Do you agree with that, Mr. Cotogno? 14 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. Yes, I do. THE COURT: Okay. 15 16 All right, then under the circumstances and for the 17 reasons I have already said on the record, I am in agreement 18 that the interest of justice would be served, best served by 19 proceeding by video at this point rather than waiting, but I 20 will just reiterate, Mr. LaRusso and Mr. Cotogno, if at any 21 point you feel like your ability to participate fully and 22 effectively here is suffering because of the technical issues, 23 just flag the moment for us and we will seek to address that 24 in whatever the best way we can is under the circumstances. 25 THE DEFENDANT: Thank you.

11 Proceedings - Via Videoconference THE COURT: Does that make sense? 1 2 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, that works for me. 3 THE COURT: Okay. 4 So before we begin, Mr. Cotogno, I want to start by explaining to you the overall process for this morning, 5 essentially just giving an outline of what the various topic 6 7 areas that we are going to cover is. 8 So, first what I'll do is I am going to list on the 9 record every submission that I have received and considered 10 for sentencing. And the purpose for that is simply to make 11 sure that we are all looking at the same documents, that the 12 parties can be assured that I have received everything the 13 parties think I should have received, and that you all have 14 received everything, so that we are all working off the same 15 information. 16 Second, we will discuss the Probation Department's 17 pre-sentence report. I understand there are some, I don't 18 know if formal objections is the right word, but that your 19 sentencing submission, Mr. LaRusso, takes issue with some of 20 the factual recitations in the PSR, and we will resolve those 21 today. 22 Next, under federal sentencing law I have to 23 determine what the guidelines range is, the range of 24 incarceration and other factors under the Advisory Sentencing 25 Guidelines system.

Proceedings - Via Videoconference

The Guidelines, as I mentioned, are advisory. They are not binding on this court, but nevertheless, the Court must still determine what the guidelines range is. And I must consider the Advisory Guidelines, as well as any departures that might apply in a given case, even though I don't believe there are any pending motions for upward or downward departures before the Court today.

I also have to consider what we call the Section 3553(a) factors. Those are the factors set out in the statute in Title 18 of the U.S. Code. Congress has required that we consider certain factors outside of the Advisory Guidelines system that relate to the nature of the offense and your history and other factors.

After I consider all of this, I will give the attorneys an opportunity to address the Court and to make any arguments that they wish to make, understanding that I have already carefully reviewed their written submissions with respect to sentencing.

Final, Mr. Cotogno, you also have the right yourself, but not the obligation, to make a statement to the Court if you choose before I impose sentence. I know that you submitted a letter to the Court, which I have read carefully, I have read all of the letters that have been submitted, but, nevertheless, if you wish to make an additional statement today, I will be happy to give you that opportunity.

13 Proceedings - Via Videoconference Thank you, Your Honor. 1 THE DEFENDANT: 2 THE COURT: Once all of this has happened, I will 3 impose sentence. 4 Do you understand the process? THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 5 Do you have any questions at this stage? 6 THE COURT: 7 THE DEFENDANT: No. 8 THE COURT: Okay. So, I will note that Mr. Cotogno's guilty plea was 9 10 before Magistrate Judge Scanlon, that he pleaded to the sole 11 count of the Information, and that that Information charged 12 him with knowingly and willfully making one or more materially 13 false, fictitious and fraudulent statements and 14 representations, and that this was charged as a violation of 15 Title 18 U.S. Code Section 1001(a)(2). 16 I have received the following documents in 17 preparation for this sentencing hearing: 18 The pre-sentence report dated December 20th of 2019. 19 I have a confidential recommendation from the Probation 20 Department regarding the sentence that the Probation 21 Department recommends be imposed, restitution, fine, other 22 factors. 23 I have the Government's sentencing memorandum dated 24 May 18th, 2020. 25 I have the defendant's sentencing memorandum dated

May 18th, 2020.

I have a series of letters in support of the defendant. Letters from a number of family members, including the defendant's daughter, Jillian DeFazio, dated May 4th, 2020; a letter from his son, Stephen Cotogno, dated May 5th, 2020; and several letters from friends, including Patrick DeRespinis, dated October 9th; Kenneth Lee, dated October 8th, 2019; Felix Schirripa, dated October 8th, 2019; Marcos Chang, dated October 14th, 2019; a letter from the defendant's physician confirming his physical condition, and a letter from the physician, dated July 9th 2018. And I don't know if "physician" is the right word there, that may be a different type of practitioner, but I have read that letter carefully.

I also have the Government's letter regarding restitution and victim identities in this case that was just submitted on Friday of this past week in response to the order that I put on the docket on Friday.

Mr. LaRusso, I just want to make sure that you saw the Government's most recent submission, given how recently it was submitted.

MR. LaRUSSO: Your Honor, I saw it before it was filed and I read it after it was filed, and I provided a copy to my client. I'm not sure what day I provided it, but it was

```
Proceedings - Via Videoconference
                                                                  15
    shortly after it was filed.
1
 2
              THE COURT:
                          Okav.
 3
              Mr. Cotogno, that was because I had some questions
 4
    about -- I understood you have an agreement on restitution
    with the Government as far as the amount of restitution that
5
    will be paid, but I didn't understand, getting ready for
6
7
    today's proceedings, who that restitution was going to be paid
8
    to and how it would be paid to them. And so I asked for a
9
    further follow-up from the Government, which they provided
10
    expeditiously, and I understand that your lawyer was in that
11
    loop as well.
12
                              He provided it to me.
              THE DEFENDANT:
13
              THE COURT:
                          Thank you.
14
              Is there anything else that I should have,
    Mr. McDonald?
15
16
              MR. McDONALD: No, nothing comes to mind, Your
17
    Honor.
18
              THE COURT:
                          Okay.
19
              Anything else, Mr. LaRusso, that I should have?
20
              MR. LaRUSSO: No, Your Honor, not that I can think
21
    of.
22
              THE COURT:
                          Okay. And, Mr. LaRusso, have you and
23
    your client read and discussed the pre-sentence report?
24
              MR. LaRUSSO: We have thoroughly, Your Honor.
              THE COURT: Okay.
25
```

Proceedings - Via Videoconference

Before proceeding further, I just want to briefly come back to this question of what we are sealing on the record here. We had some back-and-forth about what would be sealed. Mr. Cotogno, you have now asked to seal your medical records in their entirety, which I understand. There was also some back-and-forth about the question of whether we would redact on the record the name of an alleged co-conspirator who has not yet been indicted.

As to the proposed redactions that the defense has made to date, I find that all of those proposed redactions of the exhibits are narrowly tailored to legitimate privacy interests, both the defendant's medical conditions and also the interest of the alleged unindicted co-conspirator.

But there are, I think, some additional references to that alleged unindicted co-conspirator's name, and I just want to ask both parties whether they have a position on whether we should be making further redactions to make sure that that person's name is redacted everywhere it appears?

Mr. McDonald, does the Government have a view on that?

MR. McDONALD: I don't have. I don't have a view on that. It's Mr. LaRusso's application. I don't have any objection to it, but I am not able to make my own application for it.

THE COURT: Okay.

Proceedings - Via Videoconference 17 MR. LaRUSSO: Your Honor, if I could. 1 2 I'm very sensitive, having been an assistant, to 3 disclosing in public records the name of confidential 4 informants. What I did in the redaction was leave Mr. -- the 5 cooperator's name in the file document, but in no way discloses him to be an informant. I took out the footnote, 6 7 which would have probably identified him as such. So upon 8 reading the redacted indictment, you wouldn't in any way draw 9 the inference that he was a cooperator. That's why I just 10 removed the footnote, to prevent that inference from being 11 drawn. 12 THE COURT: Okay. 13 All right, so based on that colloquy, I now find 14 that the proposed redactions are narrowly tailored to 15 legitimate privacy interests and I order those redactions 16 made. 17 Is either party seeking an evidentiary hearing today 18 on any issue? I take it the answer is no. 19 MR. McDONALD: The Government is not seeking a 20 hearing, Your Honor. MR. LaRUSSO: No, Your Honor. We neither are 21 22 seeking it at all. 23 I know you referenced earlier in our sentencing 24 submission we had commented upon some of the factual aspects 25 of the pre-sentence report. We are not taking exception to

Proceedings - Via Videoconference

those facts, we just are seeking clarification for the Court's understanding of my client's role in the underlying offense.

It was just by way of clarification, expansion of the facts, explanation, it was no exception taken to the presentation warranting a hearing.

THE COURT: Okay, and we will get into the specific facts alleged in the PSR that the defendants may have a different view about, but let me now turn to the calculation of the advisory guidelines range.

So, according to the pre-sentence report, the Probation Department calculates the total offense level as 4, which is based on the calculation that is reflected in paragraphs 14 through 23 of the PSR. And the way they get there is that the guideline for Section 1001 offenses, the applicable guideline is U.S. Sentencing Guidelines Section 2B1.1, which provides for a base offense level of 6, and then that base offense level is reduced by two points because the defendant has clearly demonstrated acceptance of responsibility under U.S. Sentencing Guideline 3E1.1(a). So, that is a net offense level of 4.

Probation calculates a criminal history score of zero based on the lack of past or pending convictions or sentences, and that puts the defendant in Criminal History Category I.

So putting that all together, a total offense level

Proceedings - Via Videoconference 19 of 4, and Criminal History Category of I, resulted in advisory 1 2 guidelines imprisonment range of zero to six months, and that 3 is in Zone A of the Sentencing Table. 4 Mr. McDonald, does the Government agree with that calculation? 5 MR. McDONALD: We do, Your Honor. 6 7 THE COURT: Mr. LaRusso, does the defense agree as 8 well? 9 MR. LaRUSSO: Yes, Your Honor. 10 THE COURT: Okay. 11 So whereas here, the applicable guideline range is 12 in Zone A of the Sentencing Table, a sentence of imprisonment 13 is not required unless the applicable guideline specifically 14 requires it, which in this case it does not. A special 15 assessment of a hundred-dollars will be mandatory. The 16 guidelines fine range for this case is 500 to \$9,500 under 17 Sentencing Guidelines 5E1.2(c)(3). And I notified the parties 18 on Friday afternoon, for reasons that I will talk about a 19 little bit later on in this proceeding, that I was 20 contemplating a fine slightly above that range, namely \$10,000. 21 22 Mr. LaRusso, I am not asking at this point for your 23 official position on that potential fine, but I just want to 24 make sure that you saw that notification on the docket as 25 well.

Proceedings - Via Videoconference 20 MR. LaRUSSO: I did, Your Honor, and I shared it 1 2 with my client. 3 THE COURT: Okay. 4 And I note that the parties have stipulated that restitution should be in the amount of \$3,953.76. Victim 5 information, again, for that restitution is contained in the 6 7 Government's May 29th letter filing. 8 Any other objections from either the Government or 9 the defense as to any aspect of that guidelines calculation that I have set forth, including the fine range? 10 11 Mr. McDonald. 12 MR. McDONALD: No, Your Honor, I have no objection. 13 THE COURT: Mr. LaRusso --14 MR. LaRUSSO: No, Your Honor. 15 THE COURT: -- any objections? Okay. 16 All right, so the defendant, as I noted, set out 17 various potential differences with some factual recitations in 18 the pre-sentence report. And I don't understand, based on our 19 discussion so far, I don't understand these to be formal 20 objections to the PSR, but I just want to list for the record 21 the parts of the PSR to which I understand Mr. LaRusso to have 22 raised issues about. 23 First, with whether Mr. Cotogno expected to be paid 24 over \$20,000 for his use of the warehouse, that's PSR 25 paragraph 11; whether Mr. Cotogno expected to share in the

Proceedings - Via Videoconference

unlawful proceeds of the fraud, PSR also paragraph 11; whether Mr. Cotogno actively made suggestions to the co-conspirators about what filler materials to use in the scrap metal fraud, that's PSR paragraph 5; the nature of the relationship between Mr. Cotogno and the conspirators in the fraud case, that's PSR paragraph 5; a number of proposed potential changes regarding the PSR's recitation of Mr. Cotogno's financial, especially ways in which his financial situation has changed since December of 2019; and finally, the PSR says Mr. Cotogno charged his co-conspirators at above-market rate for the use of the warehouse knowing about the scrap metal fraud, that is in PSR paragraph 5 as well.

I can say with no hesitation that none of the disputes that I have just listed will affect sentence with, perhaps, the one potential exception that it did seem important to me whether Mr. Cotogno was, in fact, charging an above-market rate for his use of the warehouse knowing about the scrap metal fraud.

It was unclear to me, Mr. LaRusso, that that's mentioned in your recitation of the places where there may be difference between yourselves and the Probation Department, but I didn't see facts that would specifically contradict that.

So, is it important for you that the PSR be modified to strike the reference to the market rate for the use of the

warehouse?

MR. LaRUSSO: Your Honor, it is not important that it be modified. I don't believe that we have to actually take testimony on it, unless the Court feels it's necessary, in terms of the ultimate sentence the Court wants to impose.

What I attempted to do in my submission was to explain my client's pricing to the individual who first came to him and negotiated for the rental space. And what he did is, and I laid it out on page 5, I believe, of my sentencing submissions, a cost for the pallets that were going to be stored in the warehouse and an hourly rate for the use of the forklift in the employee's warehouse. Mr. Cotogno felt at the time that he negotiated that, that that was a fair market rate, a rate that he had charged other customers.

Mr. Cotogno can speak, Your Honor, probably more professionally to this issue, and I have no objection to him addressing the Court if the Court feels it's important enough to hear from him, that in the end his rate that he negotiated with one of the co-conspirators, in particular, did not take into account that the pallets that they were bringing into the warehouse were stackable. He thought that they were stackable, so he actually gave them a lesser price than what he would have if he had learned that they were not stackable pallets.

So, my effort in my sentence submission, Judge, was

Proceedings - Via Videoconference

not to dispute what the Probation Department said. It might be the Government's position in terms of their review, but in terms of what my client told me and what he knew at the time, the contract was negotiated, those were the terms, and they were not above-market rates taking advantage. That's the inference, Judge, taking advantage of the fact that he was aware that there was unlawful activity about to take place. That, I -- I believe, the essence of the reasons for this presentation to let the Court know that that's not the inference that you can draw from the facts.

Though, my client does later on come to -- become aware of what was going on when filler material was putting into the containers and allowed it to continue. That -- that, I believe, the Government set out in their sentencing submission, and we have acknowledged that that is true. But our presentation in regards to the above-market price was to indicate to the Court that my client was not aware from the inception that this was a fraud going on at the time he negotiated the contract.

Mr. Cotogno, is there anything --

THE COURT: Yes, I think even before we get to Mr. Cotogno, I think we do have agreement between the parties that by the time he is approached by the Commerce Department agents, Mr. Cotogno is aware of the scrap metal filler fraud that is being conducted by the people who are renting space in

Proceedings - Via Videoconference

his warehouse, but I do want to ask from the Government what the basis is to conclude that he was charging an above-market rent and that he was doing so specifically based on the knowledge at the time that the rent was negotiated that the fraud was contemplated?

MR. McDONALD: Your Honor, the basis, if we had a hearing, would be the expected testimony of one of the participants in the fraud who -- and I don't necessarily think it's totally inconsistent with what Mr. LaRusso is saying, but based on that participant's understanding, they were being charged an above-market rate for the pallets that were being stored there.

Mr. LaRusso here has, obviously, gone into a number of details about warehousing and pallets -- palleting that, perhaps, that co-conspirator would have been unaware of in terms of what rates would apply, but as that co-conspirator, who we would expect to testify, would testify, and this is a co-conspirator to the scrap metal fraud I should say, that that co-conspirator's understanding was that it was an above-market rate.

It's not something where we have invoices from Mr. Cotogno's warehouse that clearly show a rate for scrap metal in X circumstances and a higher rate here in Y circumstances. It's entirely a testimonial issue, and for a number of reasons we -- to the extent that it is of

Proceedings - Via Videoconference 25 significant importance to the Court, we don't seek any 1 2 evidentiary hearing to establish that. 3 I think Mr. LaRusso's explanation though, as I said, 4 puts out a fair inference that someone who is not in the warehousing industry may not have understood, as Mr. Cotogno 5 6 understood, the different rates for different pallets. 7 What is clear, though, is that during the course of 8 the conspiracy, whether it's at the time of the pricing or as 9 Mr. LaRusso just indicated, when Mr. Cotogno sees the activity 10 within the warehouse, during the time that the fraud is 11 ongoing, Mr. Cotogno undoubtedly becomes aware of what's going 12 on in his warehouse. I think under any circumstance, any 13 normal circumstance, his obligation at that point, again, 14 regardless of pricing, probably should have been to terminate 15 the contract and shut them down. 16 I know we can address that, but I think that fact, 17 in and of itself, substitutes any probative -- substitutes the 18 probative value for the pricing issue. 19 So, again, I am not seeking an evidentiary hearing 20 to establish the pricing issue separately. MR. LaRUSSO: Your Honor, if I could just reply 21 22 briefly. 23 I don't know if the Court had a chance to see my 24 client when he was shaking his head yes to the comments --25 THE COURT: I did see that.

Proceedings - Via Videoconference

MR. LaRUSSO: -- made by Mr. McDonald. And I think that's the telling point here, I hope, is that my client acknowledges that during the course of the conspiracy he became aware, as we say, through his employees that there was a fraud going on, that filler material was being placed in the containers and that he, after learning that, did not do anything to stop it.

As a matter of fact, there were three occasions when filler material was actually being used and my client became aware of all three. The first one was cement blocks, the parking lot cement blocks. After he was made aware of it, he actually negotiates a price with one of the co-conspirators to pay for the use of the blocks. And later there was some paving stones belonging to another customer that was used. He gets -- becomes aware of that and he advises the co-conspirators to pay the customer for it, but with knowledge that what they were doing continued. And the third one was a cement truck actually pulled in without his knowledge, cement bags were being filled and put into the containers. And that third one, Your Honor, I think occurred sometime in late November and December.

So, the Government's position, and our position, is factually my client did become aware of it as the conspiracy was ongoing at the warehouse and did nothing to stop it.

That's the backdrop, Judge, to the false statement

Proceedings - Via Videoconference

that he makes to the agents sometime in early February of the following year.

I hope that clarifies for the Court. It's not the dispute as much as a clarification of what actually happened.

THE COURT: Okay. That has all been very helpful to me. I did see Mr. Cotogno nodding along as the Government, when Mr. McDonald was talking about the fact that he does come into knowledge later about the fraud that's transpiring in his warehouse, and I do conclude that we have agreement between the parties that Mr. Cotogno is on notice of the fraud at some point in advance of the occurrence of the 1001 violation.

As to, therefore, all of the issues that I listed that Mr. LaRusso raised in his letter, I find that a ruling on those disputed facts is unnecessary because the matters will not affect sentencing and the Court will not consider those disputed facts in sentencing.

All right, so as I mentioned earlier I reviewed these written sentencing submissions in detail. I will turn now to Mr. LaRusso to ask if you want to be heard on Mr. Cotogno's behalf.

MR. LaRUSSO: If I could , Your Honor. And I am going to use the word briefly, and I hope I am accurately describing my upcoming remarks. Some years ago I was told sometimes if you say too much you could hurt your client, and I hope that I don't do that at this point in time.

Proceedings - Via Videoconference

Your Honor, as you indicated, you carefully reviewed all of the submissions and, therefore, I will not repeat them, but I would just like to highlight my client's remorse. He's lived, up until this episode, an exemplary life. He served in the military and his record actually speaks for itself. I, at first, when he described his military service, he understated it. And it only came about actually recently that I learned that his lacerated finger was actually a severed finger and that it had to be reattached. Gangrene developed, and for the next many months, probably over a year, had rehabilitation, both I believe in Vietnam and Japan, and then ultimately in St. Albans.

I took the opportunity in my submission to let the Court know that his service was not just, you know, the two-year normal service. He did serve this country, I believe, with distinction and it is an important consideration. So, I took a little bit more effort to describe it to the Court than I would normally in most cases.

Your Honor, the other aspect of this is that, you know, since his service in the military, Mr. Cotogno has suffered a number of illnesses, probably more than one man should have to actually endure. And part of the -- part of the problem for me initially was getting him to describe it thoroughly enough for me to understand what he has had to go through over the many years, and they're outlined in the

letter.

Your Honor, he developed prostate cancer from the foliage and Agent Orange that was used by our military during the Vietnam War. The back injury, Judge, has probably been as serious an injury and an ailment that he's had to contend with. As he sits there right now, Judge, I know that it is not only discomfort that he's suffering, but he's also in pain. He can't sit for long periods of time. He can't stand for long periods of time. He can't walk for long periods of time. And last night it culminated with him expressing frustration to me that he appreciated the Court's accepting our application to go forward with sentencing under these unusual circumstances, but he truly wishes to move forward with his life, accepting the fact that what he had done was wrong.

Judge, again, between the character that's described in the letters of his children, his devotion to his family, he's an amazing individual who speaks little about his past. I had to drag it out of him, to be quite honest with you. And I find that to be a normal trait for many of our military servicemen. They do understate much of what they had gone through, and I believe he's -- he is one of those individuals.

That being said, Your Honor, he knows what he has done was wrong. There is no doubt about it. He's reflected upon it. You know, even the fact that after he had lied to

Proceedings - Via Videoconference 30 the agents in February of 2016, even though he called them two 1 2 months later and initiated a contact, re-contacted with them, 3 told them that he had had enough with the situation and wanted 4 to tell them what had happened, two months had actually 5 continued to pass before he actually made that decision, but he did make it. And maybe the motivation behind it was, you 6 7 know, his feeling that he might have been -- well, on monies 8 that had been withheld from him, but the bottom line is. 9 Judge, he did initiate it. 10 And I know he stands before you, Your Honor, remorseful for what he had done and he just wants to go back 11 12 to doing the things that he had been doing; that is, to take 13 care of his health and to take care of his family. 14 I think under the circumstances, Judge, we are going to recommend a non-custodial sentence and ask the Court to 15 16 impose that on Mr. Cotogno at this point in time. 17 Thank you. 18 THE COURT: Yes. And when you say in your 19 submission that you are seeking a time-served sentence, should I understand that to speak to the question of whether 20 21 probation is imposed or solely to the question of determining 22 cooperation? 23 MR. LaRUSSO: Yes, I think I should clarify that, 24 Judge. 25 When I asked for time served, I knew that a term of

Proceedings - Via Videoconference 31 supervised release would probably be imposed. And my 1 2 recommendation to the Court would be that since he's been on 3 Pretrial Service supervision for almost three years without 4 any problems, I think he's got an exemplary record, Pretrial 5 Services usually notifies the Probation Department. I don't know if they've done it in this case, that a year's period of 6 7 supervision, which would be -- supervised release following 8 time served would be appropriate. That would be my 9 recommendation, Judge. 10 I know the Government, and I really truly appreciate the Government's position, they don't normally take that 11 12 position, Judge. They usually recommend a sentence within the 13 quidelines, and in this particular case the fairness of the 14 Government is apparent in their presentation to the Court. 15 But I would ask the Court, maybe considering the unusual 16 circumstances that Mr. Cotogno faces with his medical 17 conditions that you would consider, yes, he's been under 18 supervision, he's had no problems for approximately three 19 years, and that a year's supervision should be sufficient in 20 this particular case. That would be my recommendation, Your 21 Honor. 22 THE COURT: Okay. 23 Mr. McDonald. 24 MR. McDONALD: Thank you, Your Honor. 25 The fraud that occurred here was brazen, and I think

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Proceedings - Via Videoconference

32

Your Honor has gotten a little bit of a taste of the fraud from the submissions and from the pre-sentence report. And it's only relevant here because it goes to the magnitude of the false statements that Mr. Cotogno gave. To watch individuals filling shipping containers with cement or road barriers from the defendant's own parking lot to -- is to be clearly committing a crime in front of someone. And then to be relatively quick -- soon thereafter called upon to provide accurate information upon that crime, which -- which happened I mean it was a matter of weeks after the conspirators closed up shop at the warehouse and the Department of Commerce agents and Homeland Security came to the defendant's warehouse and asked what happened. And these are -- these are very good agents. They were moving quickly. And information that was accurate at the time, undoubtedly, would have helped their investigation.

And I think it's fair to say that when they went into the defendant's warehouse, they had every reason to expect that they would receive fully accurate information. And when you look at what Mr. LaRusso has laid out about Mr. Cotogno's past, everything about Mr. Cotogno's past suggests that he should have been a person who would have provided that information; between the military service, the absence of any criminal convictions, the clearly successful business he ran for almost 50 years on Staten Island. There

Proceedings - Via Videoconference

was absolutely no good reason, no viable justifiable reason, in my view, that he would lie to the face of two federal agents who were asking very reasonable, fair questions, not about him, about things that were happening in his business.

And when you consider what he had observed in the warehouse, his ability to then provide the false name one of the cover names that the conspirators were using, his ability to mislead with a fake e-mail address, to provide false contact information, really to throw the agents off of the scent of these conspirators is highly troubling.

And so, when we ask for probation here, we're asking because time served and simple a year or two of supervised release, that doesn't necessarily address really the significance of this offense. No one can foresee when they may be called upon to be a witness to something, to provide accurate testimony. Mr. Cotogno, despite his health, despite his age, he may, in the course of the next couple of years, be called upon to be a witness to some event in Florida or wherever he is and what I want to make sure, what I think is paramount here, is that Mr. Cotogno keep up front in his mind that he has to be 100 percent truthful at all times when he's called upon to be truthful. And that didn't happen here and it should have happened.

That said, as we've laid out, he has had a career and a background that, quite frankly, was very different than

Proceedings - Via Videoconference

all of the other individuals who have been prosecuted in this case. He was significantly older than all of the other individuals who were participating in this, most of them were in their twenties and thirties. I understand that, you know, that kind of age difference between people who you're observing and where you're sitting as a warehouse owner could have a significant effect in one's willingness to confront, you know, younger people who you don't know their background. He did serve very admirably with Vietnam.

I have spoken with Mr. Cotogno and Mr. LaRusso, and I won't get into the details of those conversations, but I can say that I think it is fair to say that this was a significant blip on Mr. Cotogno's path, but not one that is characteristic of his overall -- his overall character.

And so, when we recommended probation here, I think it was a fair balancing of a significant choice, a significant error that Mr. Cotogno knowingly, fully, willfully made, but balanced against a life and a career on Staten Island that showed a different trend and showed a willingness to be part of the community, to support people in his family, especially his daughter who I know has had a significant number of health issues. And so, our recommendation of probation, we think, is a fair balancing and it's one that, I think, for two years Mr. Cotogno can have fully in his mind that he needs to continue following the law, that he needs to continue abiding

by the terms of the Court, and that will be a close to five years of following, you know, top Court-imposed rules. I think that that's a fair way to address a very significant series of lies that he chose to give on February 9th of 2016. So, that's the basis of the Government's recommended sentence.

We do think a fine is appropriate in view of the defendant's financial resources. And we, of course, have addressed the restitution question. We do not believe that any of the victims of the scrap metal fraud are direct victims of this false statement. They had paid the funds and finances towards the conspiracy prior to Mr. Cotogno giving his statements to the agents. So, we don't believe any of the losses are directly traceable to those statements.

Nevertheless, when Mr. Cotogno identified, through his lawyer, that some of the scrap metal still remained at the warehouse, we endeavored to find a way to forfeit that scrap metal. That was not successful.

Mr. Cotogno then worked through his lawyer -- and this went on, I should say, for a number of weeks -- went on to try to arrange a sale of that scrap metal in order to generate proceeds. They were eventually able to find a buyer for the scrap metal, and then Mr. Cotogno and his lawyer agreed that that money would be applied to the restitution of the Luthmann crime victims.

So, I think it was a circumstance that demonstrated, I think to the Government, that Mr. Cotogno was willing to take steps to right the ship and he had able counsel, Mr. LaRusso, to help him do that, but it was not an easy process to arrange that sale. I can say from my own experience in e-mails with Mr. LaRusso about it, that went on for a significant period of time. And I think even though there is only 4,000, approximately, in funds that were raised, it's 4,000 more than the victims of the Luthmann fraud would otherwise be receiving, and so we'd ask the Court impose the agreed amount of restitution to the victims of the Luthmann fraud as well.

THE COURT: Okay.

Thank you, Mr. McDonald.

Mr. Cotogno, do you want to be heard before I impose sentence?

THE DEFENDANT: I'd like to say I'm truly, truly sorry for this horrendous part of my life. And I just want to get on with my life when I get healthy and move on. And I want to thank the Courts for their time.

THE COURT: Okay, thank you, Mr. Cotogno.

All right, so, before I impose sentence I do want to just clarify that as to the PSR I adopt the undisputed facts in the PSR. And to the extent there are outstanding disputes, I find that those potentially disputed facts will not affect

sentence.

In terms of departures, there are no motions for a departure upwards or downwards from the Guidelines, and so I turn to the Section 3553(a) factors in this case.

Now, Mr. Cotogno, you may know already, that statute requires me to impose a sentence that will reflect the seriousness of the crime; promote respect for the law; provide just punishment for the offense; and, among other things, deter criminal conduct by the defendant, yourself, and also potentially deter criminal conduct by others who may seek to engage in this type of crime in the future.

And I have also considered the nature and circumstances of the offense and the history and characteristics of Mr. Cotogno in this case.

I will talk about what I see as potentially some of the aggravating factors in this case, meaning the factors that militate in furtherance of a more serious sentence, and then turn to what I see as the mitigating factors, which are the factors that argue in favor of a lower sentence.

In terms of aggravating factors, this is, as

Mr. McDonald discussed, I would say a 1001 conviction that

falls at the more serious end of the spectrum of 1001

convictions. These lies were directed to the very core of the investigation here. This was a fraud, if I understand it

correctly, that was destined to be discovered by the victims

Proceedings - Via Videoconference

immediately upon delivery of the goods that made up the basis of the fraud and that fraud could only work, therefore, if the victims were to have difficulty identifying the perpetrators or were to be unable in their entirety to identify the perpetrators. And the defendant by his actions tended to facilitate the success of the fraud. I know it wasn't ultimately successful, but tended to facilitate the adjacent fraud here by putting the agents onto a false name and description. The misstatements in this case, the lie, goes beyond simply saying "I don't know" when asked "Do you know who the perpetrators are," but providing affirmatively false information of that.

I do not proceed from the presumption that Mr. Cotogno was a co-conspirator in the fraud, itself. I don't think it is necessary for me to reach that question and I do not reach that question, but for reasons we have discussed on the record here today, he did, as I mentioned, take some actions that tended to further the fraud, like allowing the use of forklifts in his warehouse, like charging for concrete that was used as filler, et cetera.

I also, in determining what I think may be the appropriate in this case, take note of the defendant's relatively significant net worth, even excluding the real estate that he has transferred now to his children.

In terms of mitigating factors, I start with

Proceedings - Via Videoconference

Mr. Cotogno's military service. Serving one's country in a time of war may be the highest form of public service that exists in this country and it is, therefore, very much incumbent on me, I think, to recognize those sacrifices at this time. The fact that he continues to this day to suffer certain injuries that are a function of his service to the country in Vietnam, so to me that is extremely important to recognize. And the sentence should reflect all of the history and characteristics of the defendant, but his military service, perhaps, in particular.

I do think it is noteworthy that the defendant corrected the false statement on his own initiative. I understand there are some questions about his motives in making that correction, but in the constellation of 1001 convictions we must look more favorably on defendants who go back to the agents and correct the misstatements voluntarily, whatever their motives may be, than we do on defendants whose lies have to be uncovered exclusively through the additional efforts of law enforcement.

I note that Mr. Cotogno is, by all accounts, a good father and grandfather, that he's provided exceptional support for his children, especially his daughter in Georgia in light of the some of the health issues that she been dealing with. He's been an upstanding and hard-working member of the community and led an otherwise entirely law-abiding life,

Proceedings - Via Videoconference

notwithstanding, I guess, the PSR's very brief reference to a youthful joyriding indiscretion in a stolen car.

I do note Mr. Cotogno's medical conditions and that, therefore, a term of incarceration might have a greater impact on him than it would on a defendant who was otherwise in perfect health, and that that could be especially true today given the current circumstances we are living through with respect to COVID-19 and the associated pandemic.

So, just to sum up, Mr. Cotogno, I see in you somebody who has been throughout his life a hard-working and law-abiding citizen, who is by all accounts a good father and grandfather and upstanding member of the community, somebody who served his country in the military and pursued a productive career. And the many letters that I received in support of you attest to all those factors.

I do not believe, as neither of the parties have requested, that a sentence of incarceration is necessary here to promote the factors under 3553(a). When considering the defendant's history and characteristics, I do not think a custodial sentence is necessary to afford adequate deterrence to criminal conduct here and to promote respect for the law. The defendant will walk away from this with a federal felony conviction. He will suffer other collateral consequences of that conviction, and he will be subject to restitution and a fine, which we will discuss in a few moments.

So, I do not impose any term of incarceration. I do impose restitution in the amount of \$3,953.76, pursuant to the stipulation between the parties.

Mr. McDonald, I assume that is to be allocated among the victims pro rata based on their losses as set forth in your letter of May 29th?

MR. McDONALD: I believe that's correct, Your Honor. The apportionment, I believe, is by the amount of the loss, so that it's calculated by Probation.

THE COURT: Okay.

I am going to impose a fine of \$10,000 in this case. I know that that is slightly above the high end of the guidelines range, which is \$9,500. I do that based on, not an upward departure under a guidelines analysis, but rather a variance in the context of the statutory analysis, and I do that based on the following factors:

One: The defendant's relatively significant financial resources here. Even excluding the real estate, the defendant does have significant means, but a counterweight to that is he does continue to support his children financially.

The fine has to reflect, by statute, the gain or loss from the offense, and the offense here resulted, I believe the defendant agrees, in an estimated gain to the defendant of approximately \$10,000 in rent payments. By statute, the fine is also one that needs to take into account

Proceedings - Via Videoconference

the cost of probation. I do intend to impose, for reasons I will get into in a moment, a one-year term of probation, and the pre-sentence report indicates that the cost, the approximate cost of that one year of supervision is approximately \$4,500.

So, when you add up the \$10,000 in approximate gains to the defendant, the \$4500 in approximately costs to the Government of supervision, you get to \$14,500. The \$9500 top end of the Guidelines, plus the \$3900 in restitution, would come in too far below that 14,500-dollar total and, therefore, I am imposing the fine of \$10,000. We are still a little bit below that 14,500-dollar total, even when you take into account the agreed-upon restitution, but I think it is acceptable to be a little bit below that in light of the fact that the agreed-upon gain to the defendant from the rent in this case was approximately \$10,000 instead of exactly \$10,000.

So, as I note, this is an amount that I come to under the rubric of the variance, and I think it is supported by several factors here which are, one, the size of the losses to the victims; the size of the gain to the defendant; two, the defendant's rather significant financial means; three, the defendant's knowing provision of some support for the fraud, which is undisputed.

Turning to probation, the Government has asked, I

43 Proceedings - Via Videoconference note, for two years of probation, but I conclude that a 1 2 one-year term of probation is sufficient here. I do think the 3 risks of recidivism by this specific defendant are relatively 4 low, especially given his recent retirement and sale of his I think a year of probation will send a message 5 that this kind of conduct does not go unpunished, and the one 6 7 year of probation will also have the added benefit of enabling 8 the Court to make the payment of restitution and fine a 9 condition of probation. 10 Finally, I impose the 100-dollar special assessment 11 that is required by law and, in total, I find that this 12 sentence is sufficient, but not greater than necessary, to 13 comply with the purpose of sentence under Section 3553(a). 14 Mr. LaRusso, any questions from you about the sentence I have just imposed? 15 16 MR. LaRUSSO: No, there isn't, Your Honor. 17 talked to my client --18 THE COURT: Mr. McDonald -- sorry. 19 MR. LaRUSSO: My client had some questions, Judge, 20 about the payment. I told him that it would be worked out 21 with the Probation Department once he meets with them. 22 would be the only question, I think, my client probably had in 23 his mind as you were talking. 24 Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: 25 Okay.

Mr. McDonald, any questions from the Government about the sentence I have just imposed?

MR. McDONALD: No, Your Honor, no questions. Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay.

Mr. Cotogno, I notify you now of your right to appeal, as I am required to do.

You can appeal your conviction if you believe that your guilty plea was somehow unlawful or involuntary or if there is some other fundamental defect in the proceedings that was not waived by your guilty plea.

Under certain circumstances a defendant also has the right to appeal the sentence. In this case, the plea agreement has waived your right to appeal a sentence of incarceration that is under six months.

Any notice of appeal must be filed within 14 days of the filing of the entry of judgment in this case or within 14 days of the filing of the Notice of Appeal by the Government. If requested, the clerk will prepare and file a Notice of Appeal on your behalf. If you cannot afford to pay the cost of an appeal or for appellate counsel, you have the right to apply for leave to appeal what is called *in form of pauperis*, which means you can apply to have the Court waive the filing feel, and on appeal you can also apply for court-appointed counsel.

```
Proceedings - Via Videoconference
                                                                  45
1
              Are there any other matters to resolve in this case,
 2
    Mr. LaRusso?
 3
              MR. LaRUSSO: No; thank you, Your Honor.
 4
              MR. McDONALD: Not for the Government, Your Honor.
    Thank you.
5
6
              THE COURT: Mr. McDonald.
              MR. McDONALD: No, Your Honor, no additional
7
8
              Thank you very much.
    matters.
9
              THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, Your Honor.
10
              THE COURT: Okay.
11
              All right, thanks to everybody for their
12
    participation today. Again, under less than ideal
13
    circumstances because we are on video, but I understand the
14
    defense and the Government's reasons for wanting to move
15
    forward expeditiously this way and I think we have done the
16
    best we could under the circumstances.
17
              Pursuant to 28 U.S. Code Section 753B, I
18
    respectfully request that the court reporter produce a
19
    transcript of today's proceeding.
20
              And with that, we are adjourned. Thank you
21
    everybody and stay safe.
22
              MR. LaRUSSO: You too, Your Honor, and thank you
23
    very much.
24
              THE DEFENDANT:
                              Thank you.
25
              MR. McDONALD: Thank you, Your Honor.
```

```
Proceedings - Via Videoconference
                                                                    46
                          Thank you.
 1
               MS. NGAI:
 2
               THE COURT: Good luck, Mr. Cotogno.
 3
               (Matter adjourned.)
               (All parties disconnected.)
 4
 5
 6
 7
8
9
10
11
    I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the
12
    record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.
13
                                              June 1, 2020
         /s/ Stacy A. Mace
14
           STACY A. MACE
                                              DATE
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```